

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-10 will be pending. By this amendment, claims 1 and 25 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

§102 Rejection of Claims 1, 5-7, and 9-10

In Section 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 5-7, and 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Oguro (U.S. Patent No. 6,026,212).

In the Background section of the Specification, it was disclosed that “[t]o record high-quality video data (hereinafter called high-definition (HD) video data), for example, a bit rate of about 25 Mbps is required. In a conventional recording method, the video rate corresponding to an MP@HL Moving Picture Expert Group (MPEG) method is at most about 24 Mbps except for the rate of search-image data. As a result, standard-quality video data (hereinafter called standard-definition (SD) video data) can be recorded, but it is impossible to compress and record HD video data by the MP@HL or an MP@H-14 method. ... In addition, HD video data compressed by the MP@HL or MP@H-14 method cannot be efficiently tied to that compressed by the MP@HL or MP@H-14 method.” *Specification, page 1, line 19 to page 2, line 15.* Further, “[c]onventionally, since an HD video signal and an HD audio signal formed by the MP@HL or MP@H-14 method are recorded in the same data arrangement as that of MPEG data as shown in FIG. 16(A), in other words, since an audio signal and the corresponding video signal are alternately arranged and recorded, when they are tied to other MPEG data, a wasteful video signal is included.” *Specification, page 24, line 25 to page 25, line 6.*

To address the above-stated problem, embodiments of the present invention provide methods and systems for collectively arranging predetermined-unit of video data and corresponding audio data, and continuously arranging a track without any space disposed therebetween. See *Specification, page 38, lines 1-13.*

For example, apparatus claim 1, as presented herein, recites:

A magnetic-tape recording apparatus for recording digital data on a magnetic tape by a rotating head, comprising:

*first obtaining means* for obtaining predetermined-unit video data;

*second obtaining means* for obtaining audio data corresponding to the predetermined-unit video data;

*synthesizing means* for synthesizing the predetermined-unit video data and the audio data corresponding to the predetermined-unit video data such that they are continuous on a track in the magnetic tape without any space disposed therebetween,

wherein said video data and said audio data have the same sector arrangement and structure of a main sector in a track, said main sector including an SB header and a main data area, said main data area including at least said video data and said audio data, and said SB header including identification information for identifying a type of said main data; and

*sending means* for sending data synthesized by the synthesizing means to the rotating head in order to record the data on the magnetic tape.

(emphasis added)

Accordingly, in one aspect of claim 1, a magnetic tape recording apparatus includes synthesizing means for synthesizing the predetermined-unit video data and the audio data corresponding to the predetermined-unit video data such that they are continuous on a track in the magnetic tape without any space disposed therebetween, wherein said video data and said audio data have the same sector arrangement and structure of a main sector in a track, said main

sector including an SB header and a main data area, said main data area including at least said video data and said audio data, and said SB header including identification information for identifying a type of said main data.

By contrast, Oguro fails to teach or suggest configuring the main sector of a track in a magnetic tape recording apparatus wherein the video data and the audio data have the same sector arrangement and structure of the main sector, where the main sector includes an SB header and a main data area, the main data area includes at least the video data and audio data, and the SB header includes identification information for identifying a type of the main data such that they are continuous on the track without any space disposed therebetween. Therefore, Oguro fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 1.

Based on the foregoing discussion, claim 1 should be allowable over Oguro. Further, since independent claims 5-7 and 9-10 closely parallel, and recite substantially similar limitations as recited in, claim 1, claims 5-7 and 9-10 should also be allowable over Oguro.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 1, 5-7, and 9-10 based upon 35 U.S.C. §102(b) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

#### §103 Rejection of Claims 1, 4-7, and 9-10

In Section 4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4-7, and 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohkuma *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,574,570; hereinafter referred to as “Ohkuma”).

Similar to the discussion above with respect to Oguro, Ohkuma fails to teach or suggest configuring the main sector of a track in a magnetic tape recording apparatus wherein the video

data and the audio data have the same sector arrangement and structure of the main sector, where the main sector includes an SB header and a main data area, the main data area includes at least the video data and audio data, and the SB header includes identification information for identifying a type of the main data such that they are continuous on the track without any space disposed therebetween. Therefore, Ohkuma fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 1.

Based on the foregoing discussion, claim 1 should be allowable over Ohkuma. Further, since independent claims 5-7 and 9-10 closely parallel, and recite substantially similar limitations as recited in, claim 1, claims 5-7 and 9-10 should also be allowable over Ohkuma. Further, since claim 4 depends from claim 1, claim 4 should also be allowable over Ohkuma.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 1, 4-7, and 9-10 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

#### §103 Rejection of Claims 2 and 3

In Section 5 of the Office Action, claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohkuma in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,016).

Based on the foregoing discussion regarding claim 1, and since claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1, claims 2 and 3 should also be allowable over Ohkuma. Further, Lee was merely cited for teaching a high quality video signal is a GOP having M pictures. Therefore, Ohkuma and Lee, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 2 and 3.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 2 and 3 based upon 35 U.S.C.

§103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

**§103 Rejection of Claim 8**

In Section 6 of the Office Action, claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohkuma in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,016).

Based on the foregoing discussion regarding claim 7, and since claim 8 depends from claim 7, claim 8 should also be allowable over Ohkuma and Lee. Therefore, Ohkuma and Lee, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 8.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claim 8 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, entry of this amendment and the allowance of this application with claims 1-10 are respectfully solicited.

In regard to the claims amended herein and throughout the prosecution of this application, it is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes that have been made to these claims were not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes were made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.

In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number written below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:

  
Samuel S. Lee, Reg. No. 42,791 for  
William S. Frommer  
Reg. No. 25,506  
(212) 588-0800